DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 876 PS 011 642

AUTHOR Hilliard, Asa G., III; Windsor, Karen
TITLE I'm Back!!! Children's Social Behavior: Assessment Considerations and Criteria. (Head Start Profiles of Program Effects on Children).
SPONS AGENCY Mediax Associates, Inc., Westport, Conn.
PUB DATE Sep 78
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; Check Lists; Classification; *Educational Assessment; *Evaluation Criteria; *Interpersonal Competence; *Social Behavior; Social Development; Student Evaluation; Young Children
IDENTIFIERS Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This document presents the results of observations, interviews, and a review of the literature on assessment of children's social behavior. Categories of types of social behavior which can be observed easily and which seem to hold importance for most child care staff were selected. These categories are conversation, acquisition, social information, monitoring the environment, participation in activities, imitation of others, creative behaviors, expression of feelings, behaviors expressing self-concept, behaviors indicating security, changes in the child's own norm of social behavior, the teacher's feeling of how the child responds to him or her, peer teaching behaviors, ability to change the rules of a group, and adaptive behaviors. It is stressed that observations and assessments should be theory-guided. It is assumed that behavioral and pedagogical theory is always operative in selecting assessment categories, and that this theory must be made as explicit as possible. Implications of these observations and categories for the assessment of social competence, aspects of the evaluation process, and principles for implementing evaluation design are also discussed. (Author/SS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192876

PS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

I'M BACK!!!

Children's Social Behavior: Assessment Considerations and Criteria

(Head Start Profiles of Program Effects on Children)

A Report Presented to Mediax, Inc.

Westport, Conn.

By

Asa G. Hilliard, III

Karen Windsor

PS011642

San Francisco, California September 1978

We wish to express our special appreciation to the administration and staff of the McKinley Educational Institute, Berkeley, California; the Oakland Community School, Oakland, California; and the Bedford Stuyvesant Child Development Center, Brooklyn, New York. Most of all we thank the children for teaching us.

AUG 1 8 1980

I'M BACK!!!

CHILDREN'S SOCIAL BEHAVIOR:

ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA

There is general agreement that the Head Start Program should foster "social competence" in children. There is less agreement either on definitions of social competence or on ways of finding out about what happens to children's "social competence" in Head Start programs. Traditional approaches to assessment have relied on the common paper and pencil tests of "cognitive" ability and/or achievement such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), the Preschool Inventory (PSI), the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test, and the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT). A variety of other similar measures have been used. Further, a variety of parent interview and structured child observation measures have also been used. It is safe to say that almost anything which can be tried on Head Start children has been tried (Mediax, 1978). The data gathering effort to date can be described as follows:

1. In general they havs been ad hoc, a hodge podge of measures which lack any theoretical integrity. For example:

   a. There never is presented a "model child."

   b. There never is presented a systematic description of the pedagogy for "Head Start" which would justify all "programs" to be called by the same name, not to mention being considered as a standard "treatment."

   c. There never is a valid "fitting" of assessment devices (tests) to the objectives and pedagogy for a program. Devices are considered to be equally appropriate for all programs.

2. Perhaps the most serious flaw in the previous assessment attempts is that the form of the assessment does not fit the nature of the phenomena which is to be observed. That is to say, the form of the assessment is static when the phenomena to be observed are fluid. The form of the assessment is culturally and situationally general, when the pehnomena to be observed are culturally and situationally both general and specific. It is obvious that one goal for the standardization of inquiry is to be able to aggregate data so that it may be handled by traditional data

processing (numerical-quantitative) techniques, thus enabling comparisons among persons and programs. This aggregation and quantitative treatment is achieved only at the cost of a virtual loss of meaning and intelligibility.

3. The collected data have been of little or no value to parents, children, or their teachers in Head Start. In fact, if anything, it has been a burden, it has been distracting, it has been counter productive. On the other hand, the dreams of "accountability" which the higher level policy makers have sought have vanished in the morass of pseudo-data.

Any attempt to do assessment of Head Start children or programs must begin with a realistic view and acceptance of the state-of-the-art in behavioral research and evaluation. It is utter folly to demand from researchers that which cannot yet be delivered. It is frequently harmful as well. Further, assessment must begin from a clear sense of the purpose for the assessment, the audience for the data, and the utility of the data. If, for example, the purpose of the assessment is to be a guide to the teacher for instruction, then the comparison of mean scores among Head Start centers nationwide is useless.

In order to get more of a sense of reality for dealing with this task, the writer and his assistant, reviewed the materials which had been assembled by Mediax, including the proposed objectives and the tentative approach to the design of the assessment process. Following that review, visits were made to three sites where young children are served in educational programs. The three sites were identified as places where "good things" were being done with children. Only one was a Head Start site. However, our objective was to observe more systematically, using the emerging ideas from the Mediax project. We sought to observe how children's social behaviors are manifest and to see which ones might be amenable to some form of assessment. Consequently, whether children were in a Head Start program or not was not the issue. The issue was, "How can children's social behavior be observed in any program or under any circumstances?" The three sites were:

The Bedford Stuyvesant Child Development Center, Brooklyn, New York

The Oakland Community School, Oakland, California

The McKinley Educational Institute, Oakland, Calif.

At these sites, children were observed and their teachers were interviewed. However, the real focus of our observations was on the

manifest social behaviors of the child in the natural school setting. Naturally, this meant leaving out the child's behavior away from school as far as direct observations could be managed. It would have been desirable to have continued the observations throughout the child's day over a period of several weeks. However, since the intent of this effort was to propose a direction for assessment and not to validate a full-blown assessment system, some sacrifices had to be made in view of the time available.

Our method of observation was ethnographic with some participant observation. The goal of the interviews was to collect anecdotal information about children's social behaviors. We were rigorous in pursuit of the behaviors which the staff had observed and had used in making judgments. We did not collect any evaluations or interpretations of those behaviors. We did see, however, that the evaluation or interpretations placed upon the child's behavior by the teacher were interactive behaviors, too. These teacher behaviors could and should be included with data collected simultaneously in the classes on the children. Unfortunately, time would not permit our treating these "teacher behaviors."

The results of our observations, interviews, and review of the literature are presented below. They are summarized as types of social behavior which can be observed easily and which seemed to hold importance for most child care staff. The particular value is clearly a matter of the program objectives and the philosophy and child-development theory of the particular community which is being served.

Two things were clear throughout observations. First, the behavior of children is infintely more vital, dynamic, inspired, and socially interactive than any of the existing assessment devices can reveal. Second, the adults who work closest with children have much more detailed, sensitive, accurate information than any of the existing assessment devices can yield. They even have much more information than they know that they have. Teachers tend neither to recognize the depth of their data nor to give it proper respect as compared to the traditional assessment devices which are given formal psychometric legitimacy, but not necessarily valid clinical legitimacy.

At the outset, it is important to emphasize the critical need for theory to guide observations and other forms of assessment, and to interpret the results of assessment. More precisely, behavioral and pedagogical theory is always operative and must be made as explicit as possible. For example, if child control is the goal of Head Start, one would look for quite different things in an assessment of "social competence" than would be the case if child self-control or direction were the goal. Further, the random collection of isolated data about child behavior, no matter how interesting, cannot inform discussions about social competence. Such data collection may be fine as a research technique. However, any evaluation of social competence implies prior knowledge of "normal" behavior. "Normality" in this sense is not simply a matter of gross statistical averages. Normality must be seen as an expression of

the child's relationship to both his/her own longitudinal behavioral configuration and to his/her cultural and contextual configuration as well. None of these things can be handled in a professional manner in the absence of a theory.

Illustrative Elements for Theory Articulation:

Learning is a natural continuing and unavoidable condition for all humans. Continuing decisions are made by all learners about where to direct their attention and about which elements within his/her environment will be given a response. A given learner must use his/her available environment as the source of raw materials for interaction. When a person comes into contact with other learners, negotiations occur and a social rule system (including perceptual organizations, tools, etc.) is created by which those learners are to be governed. This may be formal or informal. All learners and groups of learners accumulate experiences which become both a reservoir of resources and a history which predisposes learners toward specific perceptions and behaviors. As the learning process proceeds, learners and groups of learners develop preferences and values. It is the combination of learning experiences and these preferences and values which give individual learners and groups of learners their unique identity.

Following are some assumptions about this active child, the active group, and the means for getting information about the child in a Head Start setting:

1. Every child is an active learner. He/she acts to transform his/her environment (physical and social). No child is simply a passive recipient of external manipulation. Therefore, for example, "behavior modification" can be considered as a technique for limited applicability but cannot be considered as a theory of learning, since neither the internal reactions of the learner nor the impact of the learner on or interaction with the teacher is explained.

2. Any analysis of child behavior must be done from an ecological perspective. The child's behavior does not occur in a vacuum. The meaning of a given behavioral college can be discerned only by reference to the context within which it occurs. For example, every child behavior has a history, a purpose, a direction. Further, every social behavior of the child is interactive. That is to say, if the particular people in a given child's environment were to be removed, the behavior of the child could not be explained. Similarly, a change of people in a child's

environment would change the meaning of the identical overt behavior of the child. A smile, to a parent and a smile (identical overt behavior) to a total stranger cannot be considered to have identical meanings. This simple principle affects the possibility for aggregation of responses in assessment.

3. The selection of a unit for analysis in the assessment of a child's behavior can and actually does change the nature of what is being observed. For example, either the child or a group of children may be the unit of analysis. Since the "simple" overt behavior of smiling for a single child may have a different meaning, depending on who it is a response to, the recording of observed smiling behaviors in a group of children and the aggregation of the observations may produce hopelessly confounded data. It should be clear immediately, that this latter aggregation destroys the history, purpose, and direction of the "individual smiles" within the group. The question then must be asked, "What is a group smile?" or, "Is there a group smile?" More practically, "Is the Head Start assessment of social competence directed toward the discovery of whole group changes on individual 'variables' or towards individual changes on individual 'variables'?"

4. Certainly where "social competence" is concerned "norms" must, almost by definition, be cultural. It is hard to conceive of any social behavior which would be considered to be "competent" in all cultural environments.

5. The mechanisms for analysis of "social competence" must fit the phenomena to be observed. If the behavior to be observed is fluid, contextual, and interactive, then any data gathering technique which is static, normative, and neutral would be inappropriate.

6. The audience for the data will affect the form for reporting and the nature of the data to be reported. The tendency in program evaluation is to use existing assessment instruments as multi-purpose tools. For example, the Pre-School Inventory is supposed to be useful for determining program effectiveness, informing Head Start teachers strategies, and informing the children. This is too much to ask from a 32-item instrument!

7. The universe of possible learned material and experiences for children is virtually unlimited. Therefore, any choice of material and experiences as the vehicles for interrogation about deep structure process is, in very large measure, arbitrary. This introduces cultural bias. However, the goal for an assessment of social competence should be to discover what the child has or does, given the materials or experiences available. Existing measures which force us to focus on what the child does not have (because of standardization) are, therefore, gross and full of error by definition.

8. Every assessment of the child must reflect (explicitly) whether the assessor was in a position to see what was being sought or (even if in a position to see) was prepared to see what was being sought. Some child behaviors occur very seldom, when adults are not around, or only under conditions of stress, etc. Further, some observers or assessors do not have an in-depth understanding of the culture of the children who are being observed. Consequently, they mistake phonological patterns which are cultural for speech pathology. They mistake a child's apparent absorption in private activity as "inattention," when the child's learned way of paying attention may not require either eye contact or a rigid body posture. They mistake a "wrong" answer to "should" questions as a deficiency rather than as a cultural variation in values. They mistake the child's failure to call colors by common names as a matter of perceptual deficit or slow learning, when the child's perception may well be superior and the naming of colors may be unimportant for his/her primary cultural setting. To report an assessor's observations without reporting relevant data about the observer makes data incomplete, and frequently meaningless.

Social Behaviors in Young Children:

Based upon our observations as well as upon the literature and our previous experiences, presented here are examples of social behavior in young children. No attempt is made here to deal with the inevitable questions such as assessment costs, the design of instrumentation, the reliability of assessment, or the preparation of observers. Rather, presented as clearly as possible and supported occasionally with anecdotal material are a variety of categories of frequently observed child social behaviors. These are social behaviors which may by expected to change as a consequence

of a "good" Head Start program. They are also categories of behavior which can show a child acting to transform and interacting with his/her environment. These are categories of behavior which occur in a natural setting (not contrived). The meaning of these and similar categories of behavior can be ascribed only when a macro configuration becomes apparent and when it is considered against a theory of human development.

1. Conversation (formal and informal, peers and others)

   a. Asks questions (also note degree of comfort/fear)

      (1) Why questions

      "Why them two get to read now?"
      "Why her mother keeps on sending her outside?"

      (2) How questions

      "How did you learn to read?" (to the teacher)

      (3) What questions

      "What's your name?" (to adult visitor)

      (4) Who questions

      "Who is that man?" (about a visitor)

   b. Explains (spontaneously or upon request)

      "I'm doing this because"
      Can explain what happened in a dispute

   c. Volunteers information on what family members do

      (very likely a part of the vicarious materials for identity formation and social learning)

      Complains with the information

      Volunteers information on school (teachers and children) at home.

   d. Describes present activity to peers spontaneously

2. Has social information of many types. This obviously varies with the situation.

   a. Knows the names of his/her peers.
      Knows the names of adults (family, staff)

b. Knows the group rules.

"You are not supposed to."

c. Knows the family rules.

"My Mommie says I can't eat _____."
"I must"
"I should"

d. Knows where important things are.

3. Monitors the environment

a. Attracted by new stimuli

"New plants in the room"
"New dress for teacher"

b. Announces rule or norm violations

"Cynthia, you are a tattletale."

c. Keeps track of how the rules are enforced.

4. Joins with others in activities (spontaneous)

a. Imitations of some person or event

John Travolta "captured" the N.Y. Head Start for more than one month. Children brought records, initiated dances, wore clothes imitating John Travolta. "It was one activity that caught the imagination even of the withdrawn children. Even the teachers were caught up in the rituals," reported the teachers.

b. Spontaneous initiation and/or participation in

Songs
Play
Counting
Talk (repetitions of casual remarks made during work or play)
Topics

c. Unsolicited help given

d. Picks up new "language"

Oakland children invented "the pen closed up" for a felt-tip pen which had dried out. After the initial introduction, the phrase was used (appropriately) about 30 times over the space of an hour by most of the children spontaneously when other pens had "closed up."

e. Comments on or adds to stories in reading lesson, etc.

f. Evolving rituals (Example: one child who had earrings like the teacher always began the day with gestures or remarks reminding the teacher of their common experience)

5. Imitation of others
(also being imitated by others)

copies parents (behaviors, desires)
desire to "have a car like someone else"
desire to "be a model like someone else"

6. "Supervises"/accepts "supervision" from other children

(monitoring, reporting, feedback, correction, direction)

7. Creates

a. Finds new uses for things

(Pair of eye glasses used as a magnifying glass)
(Opaque projector used in class - uses to see own hands)

Builds on what other children are doing.

b. Comments on or adds to reading lessons.

c. Makes up own stories and games.

8. Expresses feelings, such as:

a. How he/she feels about leaving school.

b. How he/she feels about dress

c. How he/she compares self to others

d. How adults behave, what they do to me

"He makes me put crackers in my soup, and I don't like crackers," also

How other children behave, "what they do to me."

e. Laughs or cries "appropriately."

f. Responds to emotions when being read to or told stories.

9. Self-Concept

a. Reports on achievements

b. Asks for attention

"I'm back!" "See what I am doing."
"Pick me up." "See what I have on."

c. Compares self to others

d. Future forecast

(How or what I'm going to be when I grow up)

e. Persists at problem

(How to tear the Scotch Tape off a dispenser. One child spent ten minutes trying to make efficient tears before learning the secret of angling the tape across the saw-tooth knife built into the dispenser.)

10. Secure?

a. Responds to approval

b. Responds to disapproval

c. Relaxed

d. Anxious to leave?

11. Exhibits changes in own "norm" of social behavior?

12. Teacher's feeling of how child responds to him/her. (Naturally, this will vary with the teacher. However, it is important information on what the child has conveyed as well as how the teacher sees the relationship)

13. Teaches (adults or children)

    "I can show you how to do it. . ."

14. Absence of consistent anger
    (Also absence of consistent extreme feelings of any kind)

15. Changes the rules of a group

    a. Causes group to change its activities

    b. Causes a game to be played by different rules

    c. Etc. (Barbara Notkin-White)

16. Adaptive Behaviors (Dalton Jones)

    Gets desired information

    Gets desired services

    Gets desired resources

    Gets desired recognition

17. "Adaptive Behaviors" extended

    (The reciprocal of the above are also social behaviors which can be observed)

    Gives desired information

    Gives desired services

    Gives desired resources

    Gives desired recognition

The behaviors which fall under the categories listed above and the categories themselves are presented in no special order either of importance or of structure. They cannot at this point be related to or shaped to form a "developmental map." The particular manifestation within a unique cultural configuration is not described, although almost all of the observations were made in predominantly African-American settings. No "instrument" for systematic data

gathering is described. All of this work is of vital importance and begs to be done. The behaviors do occur and can be observed. They are essentially "social" in character. Explicated philosophy, theory, and context must come before interpretations can be rendered.

Implications for the Assessment of Social Competence:

We have identified several categories of social behavior in children which we believe to be important. Some of these behavioral categories have been described by other observers. More important than the particular behaviors or categories are the ways that we can think about them. First, all our observations point to the fact that the essence of authentic assessment of the social behavior of children is to focus upon the spontaneous manifestations of that behavior in natural settings. Second, it is anything but clear that the nature of that type of behavior is "developmental" or that more of each is necessarily better than less. For example, it may be the case that among the behaviors or the balance (longitudinal) of a particular type of behavior is a better way of considering the individual child than some artificial form of quantification.

For example, it may be better to think of the socially competent child as exhibiting certain behaviors such as asking questions or monitoring the environment all the time as a norm rather than as changing (developing) in either of these. We may also think of social competence as being a condition, a precondition for learning which we wish for a child all the time and not simply something in the future.

In short, we offer no final answers to these questions. This means that the study of "social competence" is still at the initial stage of research. It is premature to consider present assessment practice as at a point where program evaluation can be applied with scientific precision. The key issue is,"Can we aggregate; and if so, how?" Much of the kind of data which are described here are not amenable to aggregation. For example, the meaning would be lost for assessment if we aggregated "scores" at a Head Start Center on "comments on or adds-to stories in a reading lesson," or if we used such aggregated scores to compare centers across the nation. Yet, we believe the data to be very important for assessment.

Children are alive. They are whole. They are situated in a social environment. They initiate things. They perceive. They respond to things. Their behavior is ordered. Their behavior can best be understood as a configuration. The configuration has a history and a present context. The future is also to be seen in the configuration.

Little Thomas had to miss school for two days. On the third day he returns late and the class is already underway. Small groups of children are at work on a variety of activities. The teacher is

bringing some materials to a large table from a storage cabinet. Tom bounces into the room on this cold day. He takes off his little fur-lined cap with the earflaps and starts to unbutton his heavy coat with his tiny fingers. He pauses for an instant after entering the busy room. Then loudly and distinctly he announces, "I'm back!" With that, he catches the teacher's attention and that of several others. Apparently satisfied, he heads for the coat hook. How do you code that? What does all of it mean? His teacher knows.

The challenge of this project is to analyze the configuration of child development in a new and creative way and to include in the configuration the best and most practical of our information gathering techniques from the past. As I said earlier, this work is of vital importance and begs to be done. Observation of Thomas and his demand to be understood and recognized is a part of this configuration. However, more important than particular behavior or statements like "I'm back" are the ways we can think about his statement and give it meaning for measuring program effects.

Where Do We Go From Here?:

I have had the opportunity to review the draft of Dr. Lee C. Lee's paper. I was excited by her approach to the problems of assessment. She has dealt in a very creativs way with some of the practical and theoretical issues which we must face if appropriate alternatives assessment processes are to be developed. Without going into detail, I find it very easy to think of Dr. Lee's paper and this paper as in essential harmony with each other. Using both papers, as background, I would like to offer the following observations and suggestions for coming to closure on assessment procedures with which many of the panelists may be able to agree.

The Evaluation Chain:

It is helpful for me to think of the evaluation process of consisting of six interlocking and interrelated links in a chain. These links, elements or parts of the evaluation process, combine to suggest a general model, an idealized version of the total process. The links are as follows:

1. Behavioral Configuration:

   Any observer who looks at a child will see the child doing a number of interrelated things. The way that a particular child expresses these things is special for that child and may be called her or his behavioral configuration. Since there are many, many behaviors that an individual child can be engaged in at a given point in time, the possibilities for behavioral configurations are unlimited, even infinite.

Included in this behavioral configuration is what Dr. Lee has referred to as the repertoire that a given child will have. It is especially important to keep in mind that some of the things which may be observed in any child are things which will happen all by themselves as a simple outcome of the process of maturing or "maturation." On the other hand, many of the things which we can observe children doing are the outcome of experiences and intentional teaching. Therefore, any assessment process must operate with certain limitations, and among them are the following:

First, only some of the exhibited behaviors can be selected for closer attention. Second, decisions must be made about the behaviors which are being observed, specifically observers must determine whether specific behavior is the result of maturation or learning. The decisions which are made in this area are dependent upon all of the remaining links in the evaluation chain. For example, the theory of child development will determine whether a particular behavior is regarded as a reflection of maturation or learning.

2. Theory of Child Development:

Every observer or user of information about child development, education or program effectiveness depends upon a theory of child development. This theory must be either explicit or implied. It also may be very well developed or only slightly developed. In any case, what is believed about child development will influence the decisions regarding information to be collected. Therefore, at the public policy level, decision makers cannot operate as if there were common agreement on the major elements of a theory of child development. Any attempt to stimulate program evaluation from the national level must allow for the diversity of child-development theories.

3. Theory of Education:

Just as in the case of child development, educators take different positions on how learning takes place. These positions may be well developed or slightly developed. They may be stated up front or only implied. However, the position affects the decision on what information should be collected about children and how it should be used. Therefore, it is important that there be clarity regarding the particular theoretical position of those who initiate request for program evaluations from a central level.

4. Particular Educational Goals:

It has been a tradition in America that to the extent possible, educational goal setting is a matter for local determination. In particular, heavy parent involvement as the decision maker is guaranteed in many publicly funded programs. I believe that this is as it should be. This means that there will continue to be wide variation in the aims of Head Start programs; as these aims vary, evaluation must reflect that variation.

5. Strategy for Pedagogy:

Once aims have been selected, it is or should be a professional matter as to how the aims can be achieved. However, professionals should employ pedagogy or teaching skills only when we know from experience that these skills are likely to achieve the results which we seek. The particular evaluation which is done should fit the pedagogy or teaching skills which will be used in a given Head Start situation.

6. Formal Evaluation:

Given all of the above, procedures, tools and techniques will be employed to generate information about what the child is doing. Any evaluation which fails to reflect conscious consideration of points one through five, described above at the same time that the evaluation is being carried out is incomplete and may even be damaging. Naturally, every evaluation cannot include a complete treatment of each of the elements in the chain of evaluation; however, if anything is missing, we should have correspondingly less confidence in the final results of our evaluation.

Core Operational Principals for Implementing Evaluation Design:

There are many guidelines to be considered in arriving at the final proposal for the design of an evaluation process. I regard certain of these points as being critically important. These are:

1. The evaluation should place the greatest weight on observations of children.

2. The observations of children should take place in "natural" settings to the extent that it is possible and feasible.

3. In view of the fact that a great deal of information is required on an individual child, which requires a more extensive operation, and in view of the fact that the program rather than the individual child is the unit of analysis, it is appropriate that evaluation at any given site proceed on the basis of a selected sample which will represent all students at that site.

4. In order to preserve the meaning of information collected about children, it is important that contextual factors be reported simultaneously with information about the child. Dr. Lee's paper is instructive in this regard. Contextual information includes information about the people who are present with the child, descriptive information about the physical setting and information about the pedagogy being employed.

5. "Scoring" of the results of the observation is best achieved by the application of a thematic "template" which comes from points two, three, four and five under the evaluation chain which was discussed above. Scoring in the traditional sense means either measuring or counting. Measuring or counting should not be done unless one is certain that the things which are being measured or counted are alike. Therefore it is misleading to measure or count behavior unless we have reasonable certainty that the counted or measured behaviors are quite similar.

Conclusions:

The assessment process in the final analysis can and should include information from at least three sources: First, information from interviews with parents. Second, information from systematic observation by well-trained and sensitive observers; and finally, information from formal tests of basic skills which are developed to be responsive to local curricula. Extreme care must be taken to insure the content validity of any test of "basic skills." It is clear from existing discussions and from the history of the expression of educational objectives, expressed by minority parents in particular, that a high priority has been placed on the development of "basic skills." Therefore, the error in assessment has not been an error in seeking to determine the growth of children in basic skill areas, so much as it has been an error in attempting to compare diverse programs with each other using invalid universal instruments.

In reviewing the interim reports from Mediax, in conversations with Mediax officials, and in reviewing papers by panelists, I am confident that closure can be obtained on the design of an assessment system given the stage of the art today. It is a foregone conclusion that there will be some imperfections in what may be proposed. However, I am certain that the possibility exists for an improvement in assessment which represents a quantum leap over what now exists and that improvement will represent information which all parties to the assessment of Head Start children will find to be useful in improving our delivery of services to children. It is important that this opportunity be taken as a way to focus lay and professional attention on important but neglected areas of program development for our young children. We can all take heed to Thomas' statement, "I'm back!" and change it to "We're back!" We are back as panelists to accept the challenge and look creatively at this problem and formulate new creative solutions. Dr. Lee's paper and papers of other panelists contain recommendations and insights for these new creative solutions.

Selected References

Coleman, Madeline, Black Children Just Keep On Growing, Washington, D.C.: Black Child Development Institute, 1977.

Erny, Pierre, Childhood and Cosmos: The Social Psychology of the Black African Child, New York: Black Orpheus Press, 1973.

Hall, Edward T., Beyond Culture. New York: Anchor, 1977

King, Lewis M. Blonde Wig Black Child: On the nature of social science paradigms affecting the legitimate study of the Black child. Los Angeles: Fanon Institute. Manuscript, 1975.

Mediax Associates, Inc. Draft-Descriptions of Information Gathering Techniques Used in Previous Head Start Programs. Westport, Connecticut: July 12, 1978.

Nobles, Wade, "Psychological Research on the Black Self-Concept," Journal of Social Issues, 29, 1, pp. 11-30, 1973.

Pearce, Joseph, Chilton, Magical Child: Rediscovering Nature's Plan For Our Children. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1977.

Provence, Sally, Task force participant on American Association of Psychiatric Services for Children. Development Review and Screening Instrument Development. Washington, D.C., 1978.

Smith, Ernie A. "The Retention of the Phonological, Phonemic, and Morphophonemic features of Africa in Afro-American Ebonics." Fullerton, California: Seminar paper No. 43, Department of Linguistics, California State University, Fullerton, February, 1978.

Consultant List

Bolden, Carolyn, Bedford Stuyvesant CDC

Cherry, Ruth, Bedford Stuyvesant CDC

Gearing, Jeanette, Director, McKinley Educational Institute, Oakland, California

Gibson, Buford, M.D., Executive Director and Child Psychiatrist, Pacific Psychotherapy, Inc., San Francisco, California

Huggins, Erika, Director, Oakland Community School, Oakland, California

Jones, C. Dalton, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.

Massenberg, Ernest, Head Start, Brooklyn, New York

Neglia, Marie, Bedford Stuyvesant, CDC

Marie-Pelodn, Rene, Ph.D., Head Start, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Phillips, Carol, Pacific Oakes College, Pasadena, Calif.

Robinson, Sarah, Bedford Stuyvesant, CDC

Rollins, Joanne G., Co-Director,McKinley Educational Institute, Oakland, California

Schwartz, Judah L., Ph.D., Division for Study and Research in Education, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

White, Barbara Notkin, Ph.D., Cambridge, Massachusetts

Wilson, Geraldine, Ph.D., New York Head Start, New York, N.Y.